

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated June 25, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 are pending in the Application. Claim 8-9 are added by this amendment. By means of the present amendment, claims 1-7 are amended including for better conformance to U.S. practice, such as deleting reference numerals typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Further amendments include correcting typographical errors, and amending dependent claims to begin with "The", as well as correcting certain informalities noted upon review of the claims. By these amendments, claims 1-7 are not amended to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to for a lack of headings. Applicants respectfully decline to add the headings since the section heading may be inappropriately utilized in interpreting the claimed subject matter. Section headings are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application, but per 37 CFR 1.77 are only guidelines that are suggested for applicant's use. (See Miscellaneous Changes in Patent Practice, Response to comments 17 and 18 (Official Gazette, August 13, 1996) [Docket No: 950620162-6014-02] RIN 0651-AA75 ("Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... [T]he Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77"). Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to because of a lack of labels in the figures. In response, labels have been added to the figures. Replacement sheets including FIGs. 1, 2, 4 and 7 are enclosed. Applicants respectfully request approval of

the enclosed proposed drawing changes and withdrawal of the drawing objection.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,006,007 to Honjo ("Honjo"). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 are allowable over Honjo for at least the following reasons.

Honjo shows an optical disk recording and reproducing apparatus. As shown in FIG. 2, Honjo shows storing intra-frame data followed by multiple inter-frame data portions, with each data portion separated by an address area (see, FIG. 2, and Col. 2, lines 10-13. Honjo merely shows "the video signal is infield or inframe encoded at equal intervals of a given number of frames, e.g. every 12th frame, and the remaining frames are interfield or interframe encoded." (See, Col. 2, lines 6-9.) Fig. 2 is merely the "resultant track pattern of the video signal on the optical disk ..." (See, Col. 2, lines 10-11.) As clear from FIG. 2, Honjo does not group multiple intra-frame pictures together.

It is respectfully submitted that the method of claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Honjo. For example, Honjo does not disclose or suggest, a method that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis added)

"storing multiple intra-coded pictures in the intra-coded allocation unit on the storage medium, together and separate from the inter-coded pictures; storing multiple inter-coded pictures in the inter-coded allocation unit on the storage medium, together and separate from the intra-coded pictures" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in each of claims 6 and 7.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 6 and 7 are patentable over Honjo and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 2-5 and 8-9 depend from claim 1 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398
Attorney for Applicant(s)
September 25, 2008

Enclosure: Replacement drawing sheets (3 sheets including FIGs.
1, 2, 4 and 7)

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101